UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,851	06/20/2005	Eric Cameron Wilson	366-003	9199

33354   7590   11/25/2008
ETHERTON LAW GROUP, LLC
5555 E. VAN BUREN STREET, SUITE 100
PHOENIX, AZ 85008

EXAMINER
KHOSHNOODI, FARIBORZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _20 June 2005_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-26_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-26_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _20 June 2005_ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
         application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _6/20/2005 and 9/22/2005_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

Detailed Action

Drawings

1.   The Drawing is objected to because of improper shading for figures 6-12 CFR 1.84 (a)(1)

dictates the sole use of black and white drawings. Gray shading is not permitted. According to 37

CFR 1.84 (m), shading must be in the form of thin lines spaced closely together. Appropriate

correction is required.

Claims Objection

2.   Claim 10 objected because the claim is not terminated by a period. Appropriate

correction is required.

3.   Claims 12 and 20 are objected because of words "prioritises" and "prioritizing" which are

not defined in dictionary. Appropriate correction is required.

Priority

4.   The priority claim to the Australia application No. 2002953500 filed on December 20,

2002 is hereby acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

5.   The Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, filed on June 20, 2005 and September

22, 2005 have been received and entered into the record. The foreign patent documents were

received and considered by the examiner. See attached form PTO-1449.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6.   Claims 1(and dependent claims 2-13), 14, 15 (and dependent claims 16-25) and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

7.   Claims 1-14 are non-statutory because the independent claims 1 and 14 are not tied to another statutory (machine, manufacture or composition of matter). Further they fail to be claimed in conjunction with hardware. The components claimed, (*i.e. search engine*) is interpreted as being implemented by software. Software per se, does not fall within a statutory category of patentability. Appropriate correction required

8.   Claim 15 (and dependent claims 16-25) is non-statutory because it fails to be claimed in conjunction with hardware. The components claimed, (*i.e. A search result reporting engine*) is interpreted as being implemented by software. Software per se, does not fall within a statutory category of patentability. Appropriate correction required.

9.   Claim 26 is non-statutory because it fails to be claimed in conjunction with hardware. The components claimed, (*i.e. an hierarchical modeler*) is interpreted as being implemented by software. Software per se, does not fall within a statutory category of patentability. Appropriate correction required.

Double Patenting – Duplicate Claims

10.   Claim 21 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 16.

Applicant is advised that should claim16 be found allowable, claim 21 will be objected to under

37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are

duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight

difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a

substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
> are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
> person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12.   Claims 1-3, 7-8, 14-17, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Adler et al. United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0033295 A1 in view of

Szabo United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0165766 A1.

As per claim 1:

Adler et al. teach a system: **retrieving search results from one or more search engines**

(Par. 102); **filtering the retrieved search results according to one or more criteria**

((Par. 43). The information would be retrieved based on search parameter (criteria) by *search engine*; **extracting Locational information from the filtered search results** *(Par. 74).*

Adler et al. do not explicitly disclose for the storing and displaying the hierarchy's information. However, Szabo teaches a system, **storing the locational information in one or more output hierarchies** *(See Szabo Par. 168)*; **and displaying the search results within the one or more output hierarchies** *(See Szabo Par. 118).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed in Adler et al. to have the storing and displaying the hierarchy's information. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of Adler et al. and Szabo before him/her, to modify the system of Adler et al. to include the storing and displaying the hierarchies information of Szabo, since it is suggested by Szabo such that, by utilizing graphical user interface the tree-based metaphors permit a n-root visualization and permit multiple distinct hierarchies to be presented *(See Szabo Par. 238).*

As per claim 2:

Adler et al. as modified teach a system, **further including the step of transforming a search request to a form suitable for each of said one or more search engines** *(See Adler et al. Par. 30).*

As per claim 3:

Adler et al. as modified teach a system, **further including the step of transforming said search results from said one or more search engines to a standardised form** *(See Adler et al. Par. 57). The search engine would provide the analysis a fixed form (standardised form) after conducting search and filtering the search result).*

As per claim 7:

Adler et al. as modified teach a system, **wherein the step of extracting Locational information includes the step of analyzing a taxonomy of the search result** *(See Adler et al. Par. 14).*

As per claim 8:

Adler et al. as modified teach a system, **wherein the one or more output hierarchies are constructed from the locational information** *(See Adler et al. Par. 12).*

As per claim 14:

Adler et al. teach a system, **defining search parameters for submission to one or more search engines** *(See Adler et al. Par. 43)*; **passing the search parameters to a search engine submitter** *(See Adler et al. Par. 43)*; **said search engine submitter transforming the search parameters to search terms for each of said one or more search engines** *(See Adler et al. Par. 74)*; **receiving results from said one or more search engines** *(See Adler et al. Par. 32)*; **said search engine submitter**

transforming said results into standardised results having a standardised format *(See Adler et al. Par. 32)*; **passing the standardised results to a location analyzer** *(See Adler et al. Par. 45)*;**said location analyser filtering the standardised results according to criteria to produce filtered results** *(See Adler et al. Par. 57)* .

Adler et al. do not explicitly disclose for the storing and displaying the hierarchy's information. However, Szabo teaches a system, **passing the filtered results to a hierarchical data modeller** *(See Szabo Par. 112)*; **said hierarchical data modeller extracting locational information from said filtered results** *(See Szabo Par. 159)* ; **compiling said locational information in an output hierarchy** *(See Szabo Par. 151)* ; **and displaying the filtered results within the output hierarchy** *(See Szabo Par. 118)*.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed in Adler et al. to have the storing and displaying the hierarchy's information. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of Adler et al. and Szabo before him/her, to modify the system of Adler et al. to include the storing and displaying the hierarchies information of Szabo, since it is suggested by Szabo such that, by utilizing graphical user interface the tree-based metaphors permit a n-root visualization and permit multiple distinct hierarchies to be presented *(See Szabo Par. 238)*.

As per claim 15:

Adler et al. teach a system, **a location analyser means that filters search results received from one or more search engines according to one or more criteria** *(See Adler et al. Par. 43)*.

Adler et al. do not explicitly disclose for the hierarchy's information. However, Szabo teaches a system, **a hierarchical data modeller means that extracts locational information from the filtered search results and compiles said search results into output hierarchies based upon the locational information** *(See Szabo Par. 151)*.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed in Adler et al. to have the storing and displaying the hierarchy's information. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of Adler et al. and Szabo before him/her, to modify the system of Adler et al. to include the storing and displaying the hierarchies information of Szabo, since it is suggested by Szabo such that, by utilizing graphical user interface the tree-based metaphors permit a n-root visualization and permit multiple distinct hierarchies to be presented *(See Szabo Par. 238)*.

As per claim 16:

Adler et al. as modified teach a system, **further comprising a search engine submitter means adapted to accept a search query from a user and to submit the search query to one or more search engines** *(See Adler et al. Par. 57)*.

As per claim 17:

> Adler et al. as modified teach a system, **further comprising a Report Renderer means that displays the search results within the output hierarchies** *(See Szabo Par. 151).*

As per claim 21:

> Adler et al. as modified teach a system, **further comprising a search engine submitter means adapted to accept a search query from a user and to submit the search query to one or more search engines** *(See Adler et al. Par. 57).*

As per claim 22:

> Adler et al. as modified teach a system, **wherein search engine submitter reformats the search query for each search engine** *(See Adler et al. Par. 57).*

As per claim 23:

> Adler et al. as modified teach a system, **further comprising a storage means for storage of search results and hierarchies** *(See Adler et al. Par. 121).*

13.   Claim 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adler et al. United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0033295 A1 in view of Szabo United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0165766 A1 as applied to claims 1-3, 7-8, 14-17, and 21-23 and further in view of Gardner United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0177112 A1.

As per claim 4:

Adler et al. as modified do not explicitly disclose for the removing duplicates. However, Gardner teaches a system, **wherein the criteria for filtering includes removing duplicates** *(See Gardner Par. 130).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the ability of removing duplicates. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo and Gardner before him/her, to modify the system of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to include the ability of removing duplicates of Gardner, since it is suggested by Gardner such that, by removing the duplicate the sorted list which was created by the system would be shorter and it is easy to identify document set *(See Gardner Par. 130).*

14.   Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adler et al. United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0033295 A1 in view of Szabo United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0165766 A1 as applied to claims 1-3, 7-8, 14-17, and 21-23 and further in view of Ryu United States Patent No. 6,321,227 B1.

As per claim 5:

    Adler et al. as modified do not explicitly disclose for the URL analysis. However, Ryu

teaches a system, **wherein the step of extracting locational information includes the step of**

analyzing a URL of the search result *(See Ryu Col. 3 lines 55-63).*

    Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the ability

of analyzing URL. This modification would have been obvious because a person having

ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of combination

of Adler et al. and Szabo and Ryu before him/her, to modify the system of combination of Adler

et al. and Szabo to include the ability of analyzing URL of Ryu, since it is suggested by Ryu

such that, by re-analyzing the URL, it makes it easy to find Uniform Resource locator for

specific address *(See Ryu Col. 3 lines 55-63).*

As per claim 13:

    Adler et al. as modified do not explicitly disclose for the storing search results and

hierarchies. However, Ryu teaches a system, **further including the step of storing search**

results and hierarchies *(See Ryu Col. 3 lines 5-7).*

    Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the storing

search results and hierarchies. This modification would have been obvious because a person

having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of

combination of Adler et al. and Szabo and Ryu before him/her, to modify the system of

combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to include the storing search results and hierarchies of

Ryu, since it is suggested by Ryu such that, by providing information for specific location after

analyzing the locations of the information is disclosed and reduces the amount of transmitting

data and time, the amount of data to be stored in the web searcher computer *(See Ryu*

Abstract).

15.   Claims 6, 9, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adler

et al. United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0033295 A1 in view of Szabo United States

Patent Publication No. 2005/0165766 A1 as applied to claims 1-3, 7-8, 14-17, and 21-23 and

further in view of Luke United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0116402 A1.

As per claim 6:

    Adler et al. as modified do not explicitly disclose for the file system analysis. However,

Luke teaches a system, **wherein the step of extracting locational information includes the**

step of analyzing a file system location of the search result *(See Luke Abstract).*

    Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the file

system analysis. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary

skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of combination of Adler

et al. and Szabo and Luke before him/her, to modify the system of combination of Adler et al.

and Szabo to include the file system analysis of Luke, since it is suggested by Luke such that, by

analyzing the file system it would easy to identify the duplicate content in a plurality of different

files and this would improve the content searching and the search result would include fewer

duplicate results *(See Luke Abstract).*

As per claim 9:

Adler et al. as modified do not explicitly disclose for the merging the search result.

However, Luke teaches a system, **further including the steps of retrieving further search**

results from one or more search engines and merging the search results to the one or more

output hierarchies *(See Luke Par. 16).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the

merging the search result. This modification would have been obvious because a person having

ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of combination

of Adler et al. and Szabo and Luke before him/her, to modify the system of combination of Adler

et al. and Szabo to include the merging the search result of Luke, since it is suggested by Luke

such that, during merging duplicate copies are deleted, to be replaced by indexes which identify

the inclusion of the remaining Information Component within files at a number of different

logical positions in the directory structure *(See Luke Par. 16).*

As per claim 24:

Adler et al. as modified do not explicitly disclose for the merging the search result.

However, Luke teaches a system, w**herein the storage means provide the capacity to merge**

new results with stored results *(See Luke Par. 16).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the

merging the search result. This modification would have been obvious because a person having

ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of combination

of Adler et al. and Szabo and Luke before him/her, to modify the system of combination of Adler

et al. and Szabo to include the merging the search result of Luke, since it is suggested by Luke

such that, during merging, duplicate copies are deleted, to be replaced by indexes which identify

the inclusion of the remaining Information Component within files at a number of different

logical positions in the directory structure *(See Luke Par. 16)*.

16.   Claims 10,12, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Adler et al. United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0033295 A1 in view of Szabo United

States Patent Publication No. 2005/0165766 A1 as applied to claims 1-3, 7-8, 14-17, and 21-23

and further in view of Makus et al. United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0059210 A1.

As per claim 10:

Adler et al. as modified do not explicitly disclose for the manipulating output hierarchies

to move search result. However, Makus et al. teach a system, **further including the steps of**

manipulating said output hierarchies to collapse, expand, move or flag said search results

(See Makus et al. Par. 19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the manipulating output hierarchies to move search result. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo and Makus et al. before him/her, to modify the system of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to include the manipulating output hierarchies to move search result of Makus et al., since it is suggested by Makus et al. such that, by separating user's added data , both the data structure and the ordered array can be updated and moved to a different device without changing user added data *(See Makus et al. Par. 19)*.

As per claim 12:

Adler et al. as modified do not explicitly disclose for the sorting and prioritizing. However, Makus et al. teach a system, **further including the steps of sorting and prioritising the search results within an output hierarchy or between output hierarchies** *(See Makus et al. Par. 67)*.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the sorting and prioritizing. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo and Makus et al. before him/her, to modify the system of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to include the sorting and prioritizing of Makus et al., since it is suggested by

Makus et al. such that, the categories in the index search is presorted in alphabetical or any other

order in the hierarchical tree structure and this sorting would provide easy access to the data in

the tree structure *(See Makus et al. Par. 67)*.

As per claim 18:

Adler et al. as modified do not explicitly disclose for the manipulating output hierarchies

to move search result. However, Makus et al. teach a system, **further comprising means for**

manipulating said hierarchies to collapse, expand, move or flag said search results *(See*

Makus et al. Par. 19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the

manipulating output hierarchies to move search result. This modification would have been

obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made,

having the teachings of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo and Makus et al. before him/her,

to modify the system of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to include the manipulating output

hierarchies to move search result of Makus et al., since it is suggested by Makus et al. such that,

by separating user's added data , both the data structure and the ordered array can be updated and

moved to a different device without changing user added data *(See Makus et al. Par.*

19).

As per claim 20:

Adler et al. as modified do not explicitly disclose for the sorting and prioritizing and display in hierarchies. However, Makus et al. teach a system, **further comprising a display means that sorts and prioritises the search results within a display hierarchy or between display hierarchies** *(See Makus et al. Par. 67).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the sorting and prioritizing and display in hierarchies. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo and Makus et al. before him/her, to modify the system of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to include the sorting and prioritizing and display in hierarchies of Makus et al., since it is suggested by Makus et al. such that, the categories in the index search is presorted in alphabetical or any other order in the hierarchical tree structure and this sorting would provide easy access to the data in the tree structure for display of the hierarchical relationship between the nodes based upon an address of the data for a node in the memory *(See Makus et al. Par. 67).*

17.   Claims 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adler et al. United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0033295 A1 in view of Szabo United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0165766 A1 as applied to claims 1-3, 7-8, 14-17, and 21-23 and further in view of Iron et al. United States Patent Publication No. 2001/0035885 A1.

As per claim 11:

Adler et al. as modified do not explicitly disclose for the adding notes and discussions to search result. However, Iron et al. teach a system, **further including the steps of adding notes and discussions to search results and/or hierarchies** *(See Iron et al. Par. 66).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the adding notes and discussions to search result. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo and Iron et al. before him/her, to modify the system of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to include the adding notes and discussions to search result of Iron et al., since it is suggested by Iron et al. such that, by adding information to the search result would improve the user chance to locate a wanted site out of a large quantity of search result *(See Iron et al. Par. 66).*

As per claim 19:

Adler et al. as modified do not explicitly disclose for the adding notes and discussions to search result. However, Iron et al. teach a system, **further comprising means for adding notes and discussions to search results and/or hierarchies** *(See Iron et al. Par. 66).*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the adding notes and discussions to search result. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings

of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo and Iron et al. before him/her, to modify the system of

combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to include the adding notes and discussions to search

result of Iron et al., since it is suggested by Iron et al. such that, by adding information to the

search result would improve the user chance to locate a wanted site out of a large quantity of

search result *(See Iron et al. Par. 66)*.

18.   Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adler et al.

United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0033295 A1 in view of Szabo United States Patent

Publication No. 2005/0165766 A1 as applied to claims 1-3, 7-8, 14-17, and 21-23 and further in

view of Mathews et al. United States Patent No. 5,359,723.

As per claim 25:

        Adler et al. as modified teach a system, **wherein the hierarchical data modeller**

comprises means for extracting location and meta information from a search engine result

set *(See Szabo Par. 112)*; **means for compiling the location and meta information**

into a hierarchical storage location *(See Szabo Par. 151)*; **and means for retrieving**

and displaying like information from the storage location *(See Szabo Par. 118)*.

        Adler as modified do not exclusively disclose for the N-way hierarchical storage location.

However, Mathews et al. teach a system comprises **N-way hierarchical storage location** *(See*

Mathews et al. Col. 2 lines 42-52).

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the N-way

hierarchical storage location. This modification would have been obvious because a person

having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of

combination of Adler et al. and Szabo and Mathews et al. before him/her, to modify the system

of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to include the N-way hierarchical storage location of

Mathews et al., since it is suggested by Mathews et al. such that, the second level write back

cache memory is optimized to complement the first level write through cache memory *(See*

Mathews et al. Col. 2 lines 29-52).

As per claim 26:

　　Adler et al. teach a system comprising: **means for retrieving like information from the**

storage location *(See Adler et al. Par. 121).*

　　Adler et al. do not explicitly disclose for the hierarchy's information. However, Szabo

teaches a system, **means for extracting location and meta information from a search engine**

result set *(See Szabo Par. 112)*; **means for compiling the location and meta**

information into a hierarchical storage location *(See Szabo Par. 151).*

　　Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the system disclosed in Adler et al. to have the storing and displaying the

hierarchy's information. This modification would have been obvious because a person having

ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of Adler et al.

and Szabo before him/her, to modify the system of Adler et al. to include the storing and

displaying the hierarchies information of Szabo, since it is suggested by Szabo such that, by

utilizing graphical user interface the tree-based metaphors permit a n-root visualization and

permit multiple distinct hierarchies to be presented *(See Szabo Par. 238)*.

Adler as modified do not exclusively disclose for the N-way hierarchical storage location.

However, Mathews et al. teach a system comprises **N-way hierarchical storage location** *(See*

Mathews et al. Col. 2 lines 42-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the system disclosed in combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to have the N-way

hierarchical storage location. This modification would have been obvious because a person

having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, having the teachings of

combination of Adler et al. and Szabo and Mathews et al. before him/her, to modify the system

of combination of Adler et al. and Szabo to include the N-way hierarchical storage location of

Mathews et al., since it is suggested by Mathews et al. such that, the second level write back

cache memory is optimized to complement the first level write through cache memory *(See*

Mathews et al. Col. 2 lines 29-52).

Conclusion

19.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Fariborz Khoshnoodi whose telephone number is 571-270-1005.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH every other F 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Fariborz Khoshnoodi
Examiner
Art Unit 2164

/FK/

/Charles Rones/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164